THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JUNE, 1907.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-eight Branch Committees; 19,583 members in 253 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.

MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
MISS AGNES IRWIN, Dean of Radcliffe College,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES, Pittsfield,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.

MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Recording Sec'y.

MISS L. C. POST, Cor. Sec'y, P. O. Box 134, Brookline.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women held its annual meeting, at 77 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, May 1, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, the first vice-president, in the chair. Mrs. Whitney made a brief opening address; Mrs. James M. Codman presented the treasurer's report; the report of the secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, drew attention to the progress of the remonstrant movement; and the chairmen of branch committees reported growth in different localities.

Officers for the year were chosen as follows: President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw; vice-presidents, Mrs. J. R. Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman; recording secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson; corresponding secretary, Miss L. C. Post; executive committee, the officers, and Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. Gorham Dana, Mrs. Charles Eliot Guild, Miss Katharine E. Guild, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Miss Sarah E. Hunt, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. J. H. Millet, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Mrs. R. H. Saltonstall, Miss E. P. Sohier, and Mrs. Henry M. Thompson.

Resolutions were passed expressing the sense of loss felt at the death of an esteemed co-worker, Mrs. Lizabeth A. Turner, formerly national president of the Woman's Relief Corps. Mrs. Lorin F. Deland then read a paper on "The Change in the Feminine Ideal."

Mrs. Deland on The Feminine Ideal.

The following is, in substance, an extract from Mrs. Deland's paper:

"The New Woman has existed since the world began, the woman who did things that were thought 'unwomanly' because they were strange, unusual. Miriam was a New Woman; Deborah was a New Woman. But the New Woman was once sporadic. Now she has become a type. The girl with the latch-key is something more than a newspaper joke. There is undeniably among women a prevailing discontent and a change in ideals. Discontent and change are as certainly sobering as they are certainly hopeful — a hope always implies a menace. The hopeful aspect is sufficiently obvious — it is the menace that we are to consider now.

"The quiet, contented, happy woman still exists. But even she cannot be unaware of the discontent of her neighbor, at least of her neighbor's daughter. The girl is willful, eager, restless, occupying herself with everything except the things that used to occupy her; philanthropic, perhaps, but not religious; looking on marriage as an 'incident'; alert, agitated, *not* very agreeable.

"The feminine ideal is surely changing. Our mothers had strength, patience, tenderness, courage, and selflessness. Our girls have begun to say that this very selflessness was demoralizing to husband and children, that the wife and mother should not claim the monopoly of self-sacrifice. The ideal of to-day is marked by an increased individualism and an increased sense of social responsibility. Both have noble possibilities, but the one is sometimes selfish, the other sometimes shallow.

"The new ideal attacks the old. In the daughter, the ambition for individual development often leads to the neglect of family responsibilities; in the wife it sometimes imperils the very permanence of marriage. In seizing their own happiness these pathetic folk steal from the happiness of others. When the permanence of marriage is imperiled the permanence of society is also imperiled.

"At the same time the strident voice of the New Woman is heard crying for the right to enlarged social usefulness. Women have sprung up like mushrooms to solve the riddle of the universe. Women are clamoring for power, clamoring for the suffrage, indifferent to the risks attendant on doubling the electorate. They would produce spirituality by legislation. Their fretting impatience, their incessant bustle, are as apparent in their efforts for society as in their conduct of their household affairs. Can we honestly deny a certain excited, self-conscious empiricism in it all? It does not follow that one is idle because one refuses to be precipitate. But it takes courage to wait. And the New Woman does not know how to wait."

Report of the Secretary.

THAT opposition to Woman Suffrage in Massachusetts has not waned during the past year, the record of the activities of this Association gives ample proof. That this opposition, in an environment where the average of intelligence among women as well as men is so high, is intelligent, should go without saying and the significance of its growth and continued existence after more than fifty years of agitation by notably able and respected advocates of Woman Suffrage must be apparent even to the most determined sympathizers with the non-voting sex.

Throughout this state, but most actively in Boston and vicinity, anti-suffrage work on the usual lines — the distribution of literature, coming

into touch with members present and prospective, and arrangement for and conduct of meetings — has progressed steadily, sub-committees on Organization, Education, Printing, and Interstate Work coöperating with the Executive. Thirteen meetings have been held in various cities and towns — at schools, clubs, and private houses — where anti-suffrage views have been presented, with a resulting increase in local membership and enthusiasm. A number of invitations to participate in debates with advocates of Woman Suffrage have been received and, according to rule, declined — the spirit of contention and partisan feeling apparently inseparable from woman suffrage debates being incompatible with our methods. The Organization Committee reports, among other recent and acceptable news, the formation of new branch organizations in Milton, West Roxbury, and Peabody.

Sympathizers and friends at a distance have been reached through correspondence, press work, and the distribution of literature. Eight thousand six hundred and seventy-six copies of the REMONSTRANCE, with 5,361 pieces of miscellaneous literature, have been sent to individuals, state legislatures, and educational institutions, and press work has been done with good results, newspapers for the most part being hospitable to anti-suffrage material. Through the Interstate Committee and individual members of the Executive, communication has been opened with influential men and women in many parts of the United States, and correspondence more or less active and mutually profitable has been carried on with the anti-suffrage organizations of Maine, New York, Illinois, Oregon, and Washington, also with friends in England, where the recent demonstrations of its strenuous adherents have brought the Woman Suffrage question into unusual prominence.

With regard to this year's proposed legislation in Massachusetts relating to Woman Suffrage, events have again been favorable to our cause. Two hearings were held at the State House, one on February 5 before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments on the petition for legislation providing for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications of voters; the other on February 14, before the Election Laws Committee, on the petition for the granting of license suffrage to women.

The outcome of both hearings was all that anti-suffragists could desire, thanks to the excellence of their speakers, to right-minded and intelligent committees, and to the efficient management of Mr. Charles R. Saunders, counsel for the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association. The Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported adversely on the proposed legislation — 8 to 3. A motion in the House to substitute such an amendment for the adverse report of the committee was rejected, 14 in favor to 125 against, and the adverse report was then accepted without a division. Later the Senate, without debate, did the same. The License Suffrage Bill, reported adversely by the Election Laws Committee, 11 to 0, met with a fate even more melancholy than that of its predecessor, the adverse report being accepted by both House and Senate without debate.

The strong showing of the anti-suffrage side at the February 14 hearing, with subsequent legislative action, was the more noteworthy that license suffrage for women has always been a peculiarly complicated question with which to deal. The issues of temperance and woman suffrage seem to be confused in the minds of many conscientious people whose interest above all other interests is temperance reform, and who swell the ranks of the suffrage party solely because of their mistaken impression that Woman Suffrage is needed to do away with the evils of intemperance.

Anti-suffrage speakers at the hearings met the requirements of the situation with practical and convincing arguments. That " No-License " may be and has been brought about by " mere man " suffrage was demonstrated by Mr. Frank Foxcroft, for fifteen years chairman of the No-License Committee of Cambridge. He spoke eloquently of the successful work in that city by which for the past twenty-one years it had been carried for No-License, affirming that Woman Suffrage would hinder rather than help temperance reform. Mrs. Lamson, of Auburndale, of the non-partisan W. C. T. U., said that she expressed the views of " thousands of women eager to help the temperance cause, who feel that license suffrage for women would be an injury instead of a benefit to that cause." Finally, Mr. Saunders, with arguments, illustrations, and statistics, demonstrated that public opinion is rapidly settling the liquor question by means of local option. Three quarters of our Massachusetts cities and towns already vote " No-License." Woman Suffrage and temperance are separate issues and should not be confused. Woman suffragists may believe in temperance reform, but so also do anti-suffragists; the passage of the bill limiting the number of liquor licenses in Boston to one thousand, the most effective liquor legislation in years, was largely due to Anti-suffragist effort.

Suffragist activity and the consequent need for anti-suffrage vigilance has been manifest, outside of Massachusetts, in the various woman suffrage measures brought before the legislatures of California, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Oregon, Nebraska and other states, and in all of these states such measures have been defeated, going to swell the number of defeats — 155 — sustained by the suffrage cause during the last ten years. In California, where unusual effort had been made to secure the passage of a resolve to submit a constitutional amendment to the people the result was especially disappointing to its advocates. In Oklahoma the convention assembled at Guthrie for the purpose of framing a constitution for the new state, with which the suffragists labored for many weeks, not only rejected the proposal to omit the word " male " from the qualifications for citizenship, but refused consideration to the proposition to give to the women of Oklahoma the right of school suffrage which had been theirs when Oklahoma was a territory.

The story of the campaign in Oregon, the woman suffrage storm center during the first half of 1906, has long since been told. It is worth while, however, to recall the fact that, despite tireless and experienced campaign workers and speakers plus money, energy, and devotion expended by the national suffrage organization, Woman Suffrage was defeated by 10,000 majority, the Oregon initiative and referendum of 1906 thus proving as unfriendly to the suffrage cause as the 1895 referendum in Massachusetts, denounced by the suffragists as " sham." The suffragist press attributed the victory of the opponents of Woman Suffrage to a combination of liquor interests, the vicious element, trusts, soulless railroad corporations, machine politicians and frivolous society women, a later resourceful writer adding to the list of anti-suffrage allies half-grown boys, with Chinamen and Indians naturalized for the occasion. Fortunately there are sources of information other than the suffragist

press, and the true history of the Oregon campaign has revealed on the part of Oregon anti-suffragists a measure of public spirit and enterprise, an ability to work and achieve success under special difficulties, which may well be an inspiration and example to conservative women elsewhere.

The Printing Committee reports a new leaflet on Presidential Suffrage for Women prepared by Mr. Foxcroft in view of the fact that a large proportion of recent woman suffrage bills petition for this special form of woman suffrage. There have been reprints of several important pieces of our literature, namely, "The Standing Committee List," "The List of One Hundred Prominent Men," and a condensed form of the always valuable McIntire pamphlet, "Of What Benefit to Women?" Duplicate plates have been made of several pamphlets for use in other states; also the printing of the annual report, of more than usual importance as including addresses made at our Annual Meeting by Miss Agnes Irwin, dean of Radcliffe college, Miss Mary Jordan of Smith College, and Mrs. L. K. Matthews, president of the Graduates Club of Radcliffe College, should be noted. And the REMONSTRANCE has been published and distributed more widely than heretofore. The plan of the quarterly issue of the latter — four times instead of but once during the year — will, it is believed, meet the long-felt need of a medium for the more frequent expression and wider diffusion of anti-suffrage opinion.

The importance of the careful reading of our literature should be more often and more strongly emphasized. As reading matter it presents much that is valuable and interesting, and by its aid our members may more fully equip themselves with reasons for the faith that is in them.

Branch committees have expressed their continued interest in our work by local effort and by attendance at the chairman's meetings and State House hearings. The hearings as now conducted are orderly functions, not without their humorous aspects, where one may hear Woman Suffrage argued pro and con and learn something of the machinery of government at first hand. Attendance of our members has increased of late and they are urged to attend whenever possible, as evidence of interest in the anti-suffrage cause and of appreciation of the efforts of our counsel and speakers. The chairman's meetings, pleasant and social occasions held in Boston at private houses several times during the past winter, served the double purpose of bringing the Executive and Branch committees into closer touch and of promoting the more frequent discussion of our work and interests. As a successful experiment they will doubtless be repeated another year.

The Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women is now entering upon the twelfth year of its existence, with 12,553 members, all women of twenty-one years of age and over, members by personal signature, not mere sympathizers. Each year careful revision is made of the membership list and names are removed of those who by reason of death, change of residence, or for other cause have ceased to be members. The Standing Committee numbers 317, and there are 38 branch committees representing 253 cities and towns. The increase in the scope and efficiency of anti-suffrage achievement during the past year will, it is hoped, ensure a corresponding increase in the interest of our members, and their continued coöperation in all branches of our work. The Executive urges the special need of further opportunity in the way of meetings in private houses and elsewhere for the presentation of anti-suffrage views and of additions to our membership.

Miss Caroline Stephen, an Englishwoman and anti-suffragist, in her able article on "Women and Politics" in the February "Nineteenth Century," reprinted in the March 9 number of "Littell's Living Age," speaks of writing "in behalf of a great though silent multitude of women" in England. In this state 17,000 women, members of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, ask for the ballot; it is in behalf of "the great though silent multitude" of other Massachusetts women, the more than 900,000 who have expressed no desire for the ballot and upon whom the imposition of regularly recurring political duties unasked and undesired would seem an obvious injustice, that this association was organized and carries on its work.

Woman Suffrage is asked for in the name of "woman's rights." Surely it is a curious conception of "woman's rights" which contends that if but one woman desires the ballot with accompanying political responsibilities, all women should be burdened with them, and contemplates the coercion by law of a large and unwilling majority for the satisfaction of a very inconsiderable, if urgent, minority! As the conduct of the male citizen in relation to public interests is regulated by the will of the majority, so should the conduct of the female citizen be subject to the same regulation. And we submit that not the suffragist minority, but a majority of the women of this state — than whom the women of no other state or country are as a whole better prepared by general education and native intelligence for such decision — should be the final authority to decide the vexed question of the further extension of suffrage to women.

That those who seek to impose upon Massachusetts women the ballot with the political responsibilities it involves, without definite request or at least assent on the part of the majority, can hardly with justice be said to stand for "woman's rights," is, we think, not too much for anti-suffragists to claim. May we not even venture to suggest some far-off analogy between those who seek, in the name of "woman's rights," to make us vote whether we will or no, and those active spirits referred to in French history as "loving Liberty and doing their best to destroy her"?

ELIZABETH JOHNSON,
Recording Secretary.

Report of the Treasurer.

IN account with Mrs. James M. Codman, treasurer:

DR.

Salaries,	$2,361.91
Traveling expenses,	102.32
Printing,	216.87
Postage, stationery, telegrams, telephones, and express,	443.17
Purchase of literature,	51.60
Press clippings,	60.00
All other expenses,	24.00
	$3,259.87
Balance, May 1, 1907,	1,269.56
Total,	$4,529.43

CR.

Balance on hand, May 1, 1906,	$1,045.58
Subscriptions and donations,	3,209.45
Branch committees,	237.50
Sale of literature,	12.35
Interest on deposits,	24.55
Total,	$4,529.43

Mrs. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Treasurer.

MAY 1, 1907.

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD'S VIEWS.

THE *London Times* of March 8, 1907, printed a letter addressed by Mrs. Humphry Ward to Miss Ermine M. K. Taylor, Hon. Secretary of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Movement, apropos of the bill which was to be considered that day in the House of Commons. The substance of the letter is given below:

VENTNOR, March 6, 1907.

Dear Madam, — I have hesitated long before writing this letter to you on the subject of the Women's Suffrage bill which comes this week before the House of Commons. My time is much taken up with other matters, literary and educational; and no one can help shrinking from this controversy who realizes that the opinion which they hold about it must bring them into conflict with many of those English women whom they most respect and admire. But the matter seems very urgent, and I feel driven to write, in spite of reluctance.

It is much to be hoped that the protest of the women you represent may have some effect upon the opinion of the House of Commons. As one who has had the warmest sympathy from her youth up with the various movements for the higher education and the professional training of women; who, moreover, has strongly resented their exclusion for so long from the local bodies of the county, and rejoices that the present government is at last going to remedy so great an injustice, I can hardly be thought to be expressing mere old-fashioned prejudice when I beg the majority of the present House of Commons not to indorse Mr. Dickinson's bill. It is, no doubt, very difficult to draw the line clearly between local and imperial government; the two spheres must always overlap. But, broadly speaking, women are entitled to vote in the one sphere, because they are fully competent to take a practical part in its administration, and to form the opinions of actual experience on the issues presented. In the case of the imperial government this is not so, simply because women are women, and their work in the world is different from that of men. In this sphere they are only entitled to the influence of educated opinion, which they must always have, and the more fully as the influence of women extends. In asking for the vote, they are grasping at direct political power, without the possibility, in a majority of issues, of combining with it direct political responsibility — the responsibility of action. And this is impossible simply because they are women. It is of no use to labor the point; we all know what are the broad fields of action — action of many kinds, not merely or chiefly that involved in war — on which the very existence of our state depends, and into which women, because they are women, can never enter.

We are told that the vote is necessary in order that the interests of working women may be duly represented in Parliament. But from an anxious and perennial consideration of the interests of women and children by Parliament has sprung the great code of factory law which has made England great. And if it is just, owing to their better education, that the views of women on the industrial legislation which concerns them should be more directly expressed in the future, surely some means could be found, through some form of departmental or even Parliamentary Committee, for securing this end. Women are now to sit on the local bodies of England; cannot some way be devised by which, through these women representatives, the opinion of women on questions which specially concern them might be constitutionally expressed?

On the other hand, if the Parliamentary vote is granted, an immense addition will be made, either at once or ultimately, to the ignorant, unstable vote among us, already so large; and the safety of the common state on which we all depend will be thereby so much weakened for the sake of ends which may be abundantly reached in other ways. Moreover, there are signs that, if women obtain the Parliamentary vote, there is a very serious danger of reaction in industrial legislation. Certainly one cannot study various manifestoes lately put forward without feeling that if women had possessed the vote from the forties onwards, our wonderful code of factory law, under which Lancashire and Yorkshire have grown to greatness and prosperity, would either have been far less efficient or far more tardily attained, to the infinite detriment of the nation both in health and wealth. And the argument that wages can be raised by the possession and use of the vote, however keenly it may appeal to the sympathies of those who realize something of the stress and strain of women's industrial life, can hardly convince anybody who has any knowledge at all of economic history and speculation. * * * * * *

Yours faithfully,
MARY A. WARD.

Miss ERMINE K. TAYLOR.

It should be said, in explanation of Mrs. Humphry Ward's reference to the participation of women in local administration in England, that it is limited by restrictions which make it something as far as possible from the promiscuous municipal suffrage advocated in this country. The political rights given to women in local government in England *are not given them on equal terms with men.* For example, no woman can vote merely because she is an owner of property, but she must be an occupier. No woman can vote as a lodger, and there is no service franchise for women corresponding to that exercised by men who occupy buildings as officials, janitors or servants.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATED IN ENGLAND.

THE Woman's Enfranchisement bill, introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. Dickinson, came up for consideration March 8. It was a single-clause bill, declaring that in all acts relating to the qualifications and registration of parliamentary voters words importing the masculine gender should be construed as including women, and that a woman should not be disqualified from voting by reason of marriage.

The strength of the opposition to the bill was shown by the fact that not fewer than 16 motions hostile to it were placed upon the House of Commons notice paper; and that just prior to the opening of the debate, a petition signed by 21,000 women was presented, protesting against granting suffrage to women, on the ground that it would destroy their influence in their own sphere of work.

The bill was supported in speeches by Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Bertram, Sir C. McLaren, Mr. Snowden, Mr. Osmond-Williams, and Mr. Shackelton, and in a qualified way by the premier, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Mr. Whitehead, Liberal, moved the rejection of the bill. Mr. Bertram, also a liberal member, seconded the motion, and was followed by Sir F. Powell, Mr. Massie, Sir B. Gurdon, and Mr. Rees, in opposition to the bill. While Mr. Rees was speaking, the time allotted for the consideration of the bill expired, and as the Speaker declined to apply the closure, the bill was "talked out," — with the effect of killing it for the session.